

## **REMARKS**

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and further examination are respectfully requested.

### **I. Amendments to the Claims**

Claims 1-78 are cancelled. Independent claims 79 and 83 have been amended to clarify the features of the claimed invention and to further distinguish the claimed invention from the references identified in the rejections below.

### **II. Double Patenting Rejection**

Claims 79-86 were rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 5 and 14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,914,903 in view of MacCrisken (U.S. 4,730,348). This rejection is believed clearly inapplicable to amended independent claims 79 and 83 and the claims that depend therefrom for the following reasons.

As discussed below regarding the outstanding 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection, independent claims 79 and 83 have been amended to distinguish the claimed invention from the MacCrisken reference. As a result, MacCrisken does not disclose or suggest the features of claims 79 and 83 which are admittedly lacking from U.S. 6,914,903. Therefore, withdrawal of this non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is respectfully requested.

### III. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection

Claims 79 and 83 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Guy (U.S. 5,648,773) and MacCrisken. This rejection is believed clearly inapplicable to amended independent claims 79 and 83 and claims 80-82 and 84-86 that depend therefrom for the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 79 recites a data reception method including setting predetermined transmission data included in a received uncompressed packet as an initial value of update information (which is used to restore transmission data from a compressed packet). Further, the method of claim 79 includes subsequently updating the update information to information included in transmission data restored from a specific compressed packet each time when the transmission data from the specific compressed packet is restored, such that the update information is not updated when the compressed packet other than the specific compressed packet is received.

Initially, please note that the above-described 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection relies on Guy for teaching the features related to the setting of the initial value of the update information, as previously recited in claim 79. However, in view of the above-mentioned claim amendments, it is respectfully submitted that Guy fails to disclose or suggest the “setting” as now recited in independent claim 79.

Rather, Guy merely teaches that during a starting phase, a transmitter and a receiver perform negotiations regarding various parameters of a communication (see col. 4, lines 5-10, as relied upon on page 4 of the present Office Action).

Thus, in view of the above, it is clear that Guy teaches that the transmitter and receiver determine initial parameters of a communication at a starting phase of the communication, but does not disclose or suggest setting predetermined transmission data included in a received uncompressed packet as an initial value of update information (which is used to restore transmission data from a compressed packet), as recited in claim 79.

Furthermore, please note that the above-described 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection relies on MacCriskin for teaching the features related to the subsequent updating of the update information, as previously recited in claim 79. However, in view of the above-mentioned claim amendments, it is respectfully submitted that MacCriskin fails to disclose or suggest the “subsequently updating” as now recited in independent claim 79.

Rather, MacCriskin teaches that a compression unit puts a “table change” code into a current data packet (see col. 9, lines 49-55, as cited on page 5 of the present Office Action).

Thus, in view of the above, even though MacCriskin teaches that a change code is compressed into a current data packet, MacCriskin still fails to disclose or suggest subsequently updating the update information to information included in transmission data restored from a specific compressed packet each time when the transmission data from the specific compressed packet is restored, such that the update information is not updated when the compressed packet other than the specific compressed packet is received, as required by claim 79.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that claim 79 and claims 80-82 that depend therefrom would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Guy and MacCriskin.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Guy and/or MacCrisken or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Guy and/or MacCrisken to obtain the invention of independent claim 79. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 79 and claims 80-82 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

Amended independent claim 83 is directed to an apparatus and recites features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 79. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 83 and claims 84-86 that depend therefrom are allowable over the prior art of record.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Akihiro MIYAZAKI et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

By: 2009.04.16 11:51:11 -04'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap  
Registration No. 60,554  
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led  
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
April 16, 2009